

## REMARKS

With this response, claims 1, 11 and 23 are amended. No claims are added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 11-12, and 21-25 are pending.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 11-12, and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Software Path Coverage Measurements) (hereinafter “IBM”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,729 of Daniel P. Mann (hereinafter “Mann”). Applicants respectfully contend that these claims are not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least the following reason: the references, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one feature of the invention as recited in the amended independent claims.

Claim 1 as amended recites configuring a CPU to notify an information collection module (ICM) included in a virtual machine monitor (VMM) via an interrupt when one of a plurality of branches in a target program is taken, recording a branch address when the ICM is notified one of the plurality of branches is taken, and **storing the recorded branch addresses in a memory buffer included in the VMM.** Those skilled in the art know that storing the recorded branch address in memory included in the VMM allows for storage of code coverage information, for example, before platform memory and I/O devices are initialized (i.e., code coverage may be recorded for software that performs platform hardware initialization). Independent claims 11 and 23 as amended recite similar features.

The Office Action on pages 3-4 cites the “passive monitor” described by page 1 lines 30-31 of IBM to disclose the VMM of the independent claims. The Office Action further cites page 2 lines 12-15 to disclose storing executions paths of microcode via memory included in a “**control store address trace.**” Applicants respectfully point out these disclosures do not disclose the features of the independent claims, because IBM discloses storing information in a memory that is independent of what the Office Action cites as a VMM. In contrast, the independent claims as amended recite configuring a CPU to notify an information collection module (ICM) included in a virtual machine monitor (VMM) via an interrupt when one of a plurality of branches in a target program is taken, recording a branch address when the ICM is

notified one of the plurality of branches is taken, and storing the recorded branch addresses in a memory buffer included in the VMM. Therefore, IBM cannot be cited to disclose or suggest the above features of the independent claims.

Mann fails to cure the defects of IBM, as Mann fails to disclose or suggest storing code coverage information in a memory buffer included in the VMM. Thus, no combination of IBM and Mann supports a rejection of the independent claims. Each of claims 3, 12, 21, 22, 24 and 25 depends from one of the independent claims discussed above. Per MPEP § 2143.03, claims that depend from nonobvious independent claims are likewise nonobvious over the references.

### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

January 20, 2010

Date

/Eric S. Hiponia/

Eric S. Hiponia  
Reg. No. 62,002  
Attorney for Applicants

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: January 20, 2010

/Vivian Lee/

Vivian Lee